

LETTERS TO MR. HALLETT.

No. 3.

FEBRUARY, 1836.

TO R. F. HALLETT, ESQ.:

SIR: Before proceeding, as suggested in my last, to show your agency in defeating a national convention, I will stop a moment to look at the policy by which you endeavored to prepare the minds of the antismasons to support Mr Van Buren.

You were as much determined to go for Mr Van Buren fifteen months ago, as you were last September, when you threw off your disguise and avowed your determination to support him. But to have disclosed your purpose at once would have been to ensure its defeat. An open and direct proposition at that time, to the Antismasons of the United States to go in a body for Mr Van Buren, would have been regarded as little short of madness. The first step was to get up, in connexion with the Presidency, a strong sectional feeling, and endeavor to identify the opposition interest with the Southern interest. Thus, as early as the 1st of January, 1835, when no portion of the Southern people or the Southern press was indicating the slightest disposition to support Mr Calhoun for the Presidency, you paraded him in your paper as the "nullifying slaveholder," who was to be forced upon the free States as the opposition candidate. You even charged the leading press which brought forward Mr Webster in your state, with doing it, "as a measure preliminary to the design of supporting Mr Calhoun at a fitting time;" and said, "that portion of the political Whigs of the North who are preparing to support a Southern candidate against a Northern man, say amen to the plans now in progress, to make a portion of New England, with all her manly independence, a secondary ally of a portion of the slave States against the other free States." "The pretended friends of Mr Webster are using his name as a stalking horse to cover their ultimate movements, which are to place Massachusetts in the position of a beaten ally to the minority slaveholders and anti-trail States."

Thus early was nullification and slavery reared up to excite the sensitiveness of the North; not so much to prevent it from going for Mr Calhoun, for every thoroughly informed man knew he would not be a candidate, but for the purpose of getting up a Northern feeling, which should be made so strong and absorbing, as gradually to produce entire indifference to the "misrule of Jacksonism;" and reconcile the opposition to the idea of taking up Mr Van Buren as the only alternative to save the country from the dominion of slaveholding nullification.

It was nearly four months previous to your taking this stand that a shrewd politician who had perfectly harmonized with you in your course from the beginning, suddenly put me the following question: "As between Mr Van Buren and Mr Calhoun as candidates for the Presidency, which would you support?" I was too much astonished to make much reply, but saw its bearing, and had no more doubt than when I saw the article in your paper of January 1, 1835, that the idea had been conceived of attempting to get up a strong sectional feeling in aid of Mr Van Buren, and upon the strength of it, to carry the anti-masonry to his support.

The same policy became more and more apparent after Judge White was nominated. He was perpetually held up by you as a slaveholder and a mason, in opposition, not to Mr Webster, or Mr McLean, or any body whom the antismasons would be likely to prefer for the Presidency, but to Mr Van Buren, a "non-slaveholder," and "no friend of masonry;" and even as sometimes intimated, rather favorable to Antismasonry!

In the mean time, you spoke well of Mr Webster, and wished he could be the antismasonic candidate; but kept constantly before your readers the difficulty of supporting him, and took care to give great prominence to the fact, that a distinguished mason in the meeting at Boston, which nominated him last winter, scouted the idea of the co-operation of the antismasons, and said he "would rather see the country go to ruin than have a President chosen by their help." Changes without end were rung by you upon this declaration of a single ultra-mason, among the whig friends of Mr Webster. The design of all this could not be mistaken. It was, while you professed great friendship for that gentleman, and even went so far as to call him an antismason, to prepare the way for his final abandonment, and I may perhaps say, denunciation, for you have since unsparingly denounced him.

Coterminously with all this, you gradually relaxed your opposition to the leading measures of the administration, and seemed to see with much less clearness than you did in the year 1832, the necessity of "ridding the country of the misrule of Jacksonism," while you gradually came to the conclusion that anti-masonry had essentially triumphed, and that the choice of President must turn mainly upon other questions. The way thus prepared, you come out, in September last, openly for Mr Van Buren.

To this time, you had kept up the idea that there would be a National Antismasonic Convention, and had professed a willingness to submit to its decisions and to support its candidate. Now, you began to hesitate. The proposed convention was sometimes mentioned with an "if it shall be held," and such language, I perceived, began to be used in certain quarters in Vermont. It alarmed me, for I thought I understood what it meant. A few days elapsed, and all doubt was removed. The proceedings of a Massachusetts State Antismasonic Convention, held at Boston, on the 1st of October last, were published; and the result of several months preparation by yourself and others, was at once disclosed! That convention passed numerous resolutions, containing, among other things, a distinct announcement of the following sentiments:

1. That "the principle of antismasonry has triumphed."
2. That "the next Presidential election must turn, mainly, on other considerations than those of Masonry and Antismasonry."
3. That it was highly inexpedient, and pernicious to bring forward additional candidates for the Presidency, the only effect of which, it was alleged, would be to carry the election into the House of Representatives.

4. That there was "no good reason why Massachusetts should be impelled by mere party spirit and personal prejudice, to place herself out of the pale of New England,

every state of which (it was assumed,) now stands opposed to the dominant party in Massachusetts," and finally,

5. That the National Antismasonic party had become so disorganized in the last Presidential election as to render it impracticable for antismasons, as a distinct party, to maintain a distinct nomination for the Presidency."

The sum of the whole matter was, that the question of masonry and antismasonry was no longer to be held of any account in the Presidential election; that no third candidate ought to be brought forward to take the votes of those who should be unwilling to support either Mr Van Buren or Judge White; that a National Antismasonic nomination could not be sustained, and a National Convention ought not to be held; and finally that the only alternative left for Massachusetts, was to go with the rest of New England in favor of Mr Van Buren!

To show still more plainly the drift of the resolutions, it will be seen by those who may take the trouble to examine them, that they contain not a single expression disapproving, in direct terms, of the alarming assumptions of power by the national administration; but that in regard to the whole of them, it was deemed sufficient simply to say that "they (the meeting) are opposed to an unnecessary exercise of executive patronage;" while a very full response was given to the common canard of the Van Buren party, against "all monopolies, hereditary magistracies and privileged orders."

Thus far you had succeeded in accomplishing your great design; but a further point was still to be gained. It was to prevent the antismasons of other states from going into a national convention, whereby a nomination might be made adverse to Mr Van Buren. Pennsylvania held at this moment an important station. Antismasonry, soon after the adoption of your Massachusetts resolutions, obtained a signal triumph in that State; and it was known that measures would soon be taken there having an immediate relation to the question of the Presidency. The antismasons of Pennsylvania were well known to be almost universally opposed to Mr Van Buren; and it was not, without great apprehension that you, and others who wished to carry the antismasons for him, contemplated the result of a convention in that State, touching the subject of the Presidency and a national convention.

In this state of things, the Mass. Antismasonic State Committee made a most extraordinary movement. It was to address a long letter to the Antismasonic State Committee of Pennsylvania, to be laid before the Antismasonic Convention of that State, about to assemble for purposes connected with the question of the Presidency. The letter was immediately published in your paper.

It began with a *præfaced* desire "of averting the tendency to a severance of the antismasons in the several States on the subject of the next presidency." With how much sincerity this profession was made, the letter itself, taken in connexion with the proceedings of the Massachusetts convention to which I have referred, will show. Its principal positions are the following:

That a nomination of a distinct Antismasonic candidate not before the people ought not to be made. On this subject the committee thought proper to say "we applied for advice in May last to President Adams," whose "advice" they represented as adverse to such a nomination, and sent an extract from it with their letter.

The question of a nomination of a "distinct" candidate being thus put at rest by the "advice" of Mr Adams, the Massachusetts committee next proceeded to say:

"That a nomination of neither of the candidates then before the public could be made upon antismasonic principles; that is—no nomination could be made upon antismasonic principles, unless it was wholly irrespective of all the great questions of national policy which agitate the Union.

Upon the grounds thus taken by the Massachusetts Antismasonic Committee, it was apparent that no nomination could be made by a national antismasonic convention which would, in their opinion be entitled to any consideration by the antismasons of the United States. It could not nominate an "exclusive" candidate, for that would be against President Adams' advice; and it could not nominate one who had been named by any other portion of the people, because that would be an anti-masonic nomination,—and therefore it, plainly, could not nominate any body. Having taken this ground, the committee suggested "whether we had not better act separately as states," and that "each State party can, undoubtedly, manage its own state affairs best." To show conclusively how those who control Massachusetts Antismasonry were disposed to manage the "State affairs" of that Commonwealth, the committee were careful to transmit, with their letter, the proceedings of the Massachusetts Antismasonic Convention, to which I have alluded, with a request that they might be laid before the Pennsylvania Convention; by which proceedings it was rendered apparent to that Convention that the Massachusetts antismasons had determined to go, at all events, for Mr Van Buren. Having thus taken ground which rendered it evident that no national convention could be held with the concurrence of Massachusetts, the committee, after all, profess a willingness to go into such a convention! But, say they, each state must go into it uncommitted; and if the Pennsylvania Convention makes no nomination and specifically instructs its delegates to the National Convention, to which, they say "we cannot object," it "puts an end to a national convention, and leaves each state at liberty to pursue the course of making its own distinct nomination."

Now, sir, it must be obvious to the most superficial observer, that the design of this letter was to prevent a national convention. But there was another design not so apparent. It was, in fact, to induce the Pennsylvania convention to make a nomination for the Presidency, and thus furnish to the Massachusetts antismasons, an excuse for doing what they have since done, and what I have no doubt it was, then, the purpose of yourself and others finally to do,—namely, to come out with a State nomination for Mr Van Buren; for while the letter faintly professed a willingness to go into a national convention (which, by the way, it proposed to postpone to May next!) it took care to place the question on such grounds as to render it impossible to have such a convention, and to make the impossibility so apparent, as to induce the Pennsylvania antismasons, at once, to abandon the idea of at-

tempting it, and of course to make an immediate nomination for themselves.

And, after all this, you have the assurance to urge, in your correspondent's first letter to me, as a triumphant reply to my argument in favor of a National Convention, the fact that "the Pennsylvania Convention saw the difficulty; cut the gordian knot; and refused to go into the Convention." True, they "saw the difficulty." But, what was it? It was a difficulty which you yourself, and those who are in your councils, had interposed in the manner I have suggested: first, by gradually endeavoring to draw off antismasons from their old ground of opposition to the "misrule of Jacksonism;" then by procuring the adoption, by the Massachusetts Antismasonic Convention, of resolutions aiming a fatal blow at the proposed National Convention, and all but committing themselves, specifically, for Mr Van Buren; and finally, by declaring in the very face of the Pennsylvania Convention, that no National Antismasonic Convention could be held with the concurrence of Massachusetts Antismasons! No wonder that the Pennsylvania Antismasons "cut the gordian knot," and seeing the end to which all your efforts were directed, refused to go into a National Convention, and presented to the world their own nomination.

All this I should have gladly seen avoided. My preference was for a National Convention. I would have willingly abided its result. That result, however, you feared; for you had reason to fear that it would not have been a nomination of your favorite. Any thing, you knew, would be more propitious for him than a National Convention of intelligent, independent Antismasons, and especially one in which the Democratic Antismasonry of PENNSYLVANIA should be fully and fairly represented.

I am, &c.

W. SLADE.



THE STATE JOURNAL.

CHAUNCEY L. KNAPP, EDITOR.

MONTPELIER, MARCH 15, 1836.

ANTIMASONIC NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT,
WM. HENRY HARRISON

OF OHIO.
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
FRANCIS GRANGER

OF NEW YORK.
ANTIMASONIC ELECTORAL TICKET.

At large, { **JABEZ PROCTOR,**
 { **ASA ALDIS,**
Dist. No. 1, { **DAVID CRAWFORD,**
 { **ZIMRI HOWE,**
 { **TITUS HUTCHINSON,**
 { **WM. A. GRISWOLD,**
 { **EZRA BUTLER.**

ANTIMASONIC STATE TICKET.

FOR GOVERNOR,
SILAS H. JENISON.
FOR LT. GOVERNOR,
DAVID M. CAMP.
FOR TREASURER,
AUGUSTINE CLARKE.

THE WHY AND BECAUSE.

The editor of the Middlebury Free Press wishes to know how we reconcile our support of Harrison with our past opposition to him—referring to an article of ours published last December. Our answer is, that we had no evidence of Harrison's antismasonry at that time—now we have. In his letter to Messrs Wallace and Sloch of Pennsylvania, written in May 1835, we found no warrant for supporting him, and publicly declared our views. Our political friends in Pennsylvania were not satisfied with that letter. It was quite apparent from its tenor, that Gen. Harrison had not made himself sufficiently acquainted with the great leading doctrines of Antismasonry. The Pennsylvania Antismasons, however, felt that he would not hesitate openly to avow his concurrence in their opinion of masonry, as well as the appropriate means for its suppression, after a further interchange of views and a more thorough examination of the whole subject. They accordingly sent him documentary evidence and testimony elicited on the occasion of the judicial trials, in which Thaddeus Stevens was the plaintiff. Upon full consideration of the matter, he had the malice frankly and publicly to avow his belief, that freemasonry was an evil, both moral and political—fully recognizing the right and duty of the people to correct that evil at the ballot box, and by the authority of state legislation. We beg to know when antismasons have ever asked or received a more explicit avowal from any candidate they proposed to support? The Philadelphia Sun, whose unfriendly language we adopted in December, is now nobly sustaining Harrison and Granger, and are also the leading papers of our party in Pennsylvania. Only three, it is said, out of about one hundred antismasonic papers in the Key-Stone State, are now doing homage to Van Buren non-commitment and "political juggling." We assure Mr Barber that "the descendants of Ethan Allen" are not the only opponents of non-commitment candidates.

MORE HELP. The Vermont Franklin Journal, one of the stern old Antismasonic presses, comes out against the Whig Harrison nomination, got up by whig influence, and declares for the Antismasonic (?) Democratic (?) nomination of Martin Van Buren. We have now the strongest Antismasonic presses in Vermont on the right side, viz. Free Press, North Star and Franklin Journal. Harrison will be no go, IF THE DEMOCRATS DO THEIR DUTY, and NOMINATE PALMER.

We find the above, (the capitals being our own,) in Mr Hallett's Boston Press of the 8th. The Van Buren plot is already beginning to be unmasked. This is not the first nor the second intimation we have had from different quarters, of its existence. The Antismasonic dissenters declare for the Antismasonic nomination of Martin Van Buren for President, and now it becomes the duty of the Van Buren party to nominate Palmer for Governor! Here you have it. The supporters of Van Buren in Boston seem to understand the duties and obligations of the people of Vermont to a charm. Descendants of Ethan Allen! What say you to this unblushing avowal from a Van Buren mouthpiece in Boston? Are you ready to be sold out of your party and your principles, on such accommodating terms? Are you prepared to wear the non-commitment collar for a compensation so unworthy? What though some of your sentinels have already fled to the Juggler's camp? Let such examples be for your warning, not for your imitation.

Mr Hallett (we conjecture) has communicated a communication to his own paper, expressly "to let the democratic antismasons of Vermont know who John Clark is." The thing won't take with the Green Mountain Boys. Mr Clark's account of the farcical nomination of Mr Van Buren in Massachusetts happens to be corroborated in every essential particular, by a Vermont Antismason who was in Boston at the time the drama was played. As to the money matter, nothing of the kind was read our convention.

Will Mr Hallett do us the favor to answer a few questions?

1. Has John Clark of Watertown been a member of the Massachusetts Antismasonic State Committee? and if so, how long?
2. In what manner was the meeting at Boston which nominated Mr Van Buren notified?
3. What was the proportion of Jackson men in that meeting?
4. Was the contrary vote taken on the nomination of Mr Van Buren?
5. Is there any available evidence in existence that Martin Van Buren is even a moral antismason?

We ask these questions in candor, and hope to get candid answers, having not long since ourselves answered some very proper interrogatories in relation to an antismasonic convention in Vermont.

Having laid before our readers all the material facts and circumstances connected with late nominations of the Antismasonic party, we shall not multiply words in reply to the numberless petty jibes and paltry lugehurs, with which the newspapers abound. Confiding in the good sense and sound discrimination of our fellow citizens, who are not to be blown about by every wind of doctrine, we follow the course marked out by duty, consistency and patriotism. It has been our lot thus far in our editorial career, to be struggling against the tide of popular opinions and customs on many questions of public interest. Reverses and defeat on the right side, are better than triumph in the wrong. If we stand alone, we will stand by our principles. Onward, then, is the word—Onward!

OHIO FOREVER!

We invite particular attention to the proceedings of the Ohio State Convention. See in what estimation General Harrison is held by the yeomanry of his own State! Contrast the proceedings of that meeting with the doings of the clump of office holders who pulled the wires at Baltimore, in obedience to Executive dictation! Notice the firm and manly stand taken by the two hundred Jackson men, who spurned the collar of the federal hero of Kinderhook, and openly came out for Harrison, the ever consistent Democrat and Statesman, the Champion of Liberty, the Farmer of North Bend! We say again, read the doings of the great meeting at Columbus.

The following glowing notice of the meeting will be read with interest:

THE OHIO CONVENTION.

Extract of a letter to the Wheeling Gazette, dated Columbus, Ohio, Feb. 28.
There were several incidents attending the Convention worthy of notice, and among them is the introduction of the preamble and resolutions by J. H. Wood, an original Jackson man, on behalf of himself and 200 other Jackson men, delegates in attendance at the convention. They were received by the vast multitude with a cordiality and applause that surpassed any thing of the kind that I ever witnessed.

Another is the editor of a German paper, of extensive circulation among that valuable portion of our citizens, a decided supporter of Van Buren, who came to the convention here, struck with the character and numbers of those who had come to the convention, went to a meeting of the delegates from his county, and requested that his name might be enrolled among them,

stating, at the same time, that he saw "the people were going en masse for Harrison—that it was in vain to resist their will—that from that time, he should espouse the cause of Harrison."

And last, though not least, is the fact that at a party in the evening, after adjournment of the convention, Governor Lucas, in a speech of some length in answer to a sentiment complimentary to him, came out decidedly for Harrison.

The number of delegates in attendance may safely be set down at 1400. When assembled in the public square—it was generally supposed that spectators and all amounted to 5,000.

KENTUCKY TOO!

The Legislature of Kentucky has nominated Gen. HARRISON for the Presidency, by a vote of 55 to 41.

Will any one inform us of the number of antismasons who actually took part in the nomination of Van Buren? Some may have erred in supposing that the 40 who voted against Harrison were agreed in going for Van Buren, whereas we know that some of the 40 are among the firmest opponents of Van Buren in Vermont. Mr Shaw of Roxbury, Mr S. Stinson of Craftsbury, and Hazen Merrill of Peacham, for example. These men are as firm as Rock Dunder against Van Burenism.

The Supreme Court is now in session at this place. Present, Judges Royce, Phelps and Redfield.

Mr Preston, Senator in Congress from South Carolina, has offered a resolution in the Senate, declaring it expedient (Maryland and Virginia acceding thereto) to retrace the District of Columbia to those States. What next?

Mr Rives has been elected U. S. Senator in Virginia, in place of Mr Tyler, resigned.

The abolitionists of Boston and vicinity had a hearing last week before a committee of the Massachusetts Legislature in the hall of Representatives, and remonstrated at length against any legislative action in consequence of the resolutions and addresses forwarded from the slaveholding states. A numerous audience, including many ladies, were in attendance. Rev. Mr May, (who was so rudely treated by the gentlemen law breakers of Montpelier, last fall,) appeared and delivered a powerful speech in behalf of the abolitionists. Mr Sewall, Professor Follen of Cambridge, Mr Wm. Goodell and Dr Bradford also defended the right of free discussion. The Atlas has an apparently lenient and impartial sketch of the proceedings. This contrasts well with the highly reprehensible course of that journal before and after the October riot. We think the Legislature of Massachusetts will wait awhile before adopting the gag-law code.

The rumor of the death of Col. Crockett proves to be false.

Will the Editor of the Boston Advocate send us the number of his Daily in which he belabored us so alarmingly of late? Having only heard of the sound of his lash, we can't tell whether to laugh or cry.

MR BIRNEY'S PAPER.

We have received the 8th number of the Philanthropist, edited and published by Jas. G. Birney, at New Richmond, Ohio. The high intellectual character of Mr Birney, as a writer, his excellent spirit as a Christian philanthropist, his familiar acquaintance with the system of southern slavery, and his faithful labors in the cause of human nature, have gained for him a high reputation, among abolitionists, throughout the country. Few men are endowed with an equal capacity for usefulness, in any sphere of benevolent enterprise. The number before us, contains much that is valuable. A critical notice of Mr Slade's late Speech in Congress, is written with such modesty and mildness of manner, and is, withal, so conclusive in its argument, that we are induced to copy the article by way of specimen—only adding, that we hope the Philanthropist will find its full share of patrons among the Green Mountains of Vermont:

MR SLADE'S SPEECH.

This able and manly effort will, we have no doubt, give pleasure to every reader, who has any tolerable appreciation of the free principles in which our government originated, and which it was intended to perpetuate. We republish—not because, we do not differ, *to do*, with him in his, yet immature, views of abolitionism—but, because, we agree with him in his admirable elucidation of the constitutional powers of Congress over the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia. In the mere act of disagreeing with one of Mr Slade's courtesy and candor, there is nothing that is unpleasant,—nothing that has the slightest tendency to produce unkind feelings. This effort will secure for him—if it were now wanting—great respect for his powers of investigation, for his independent opposition to error, and for the manliness as well as the courtesy of his bearing, as a parliamentary debater. Can it be that any one—even slaveholders—will not prefer drinking of the pure and argumentative, yet bold, stream of Mr Slade, rather than of the foul and freulent, the turbid and spumy risings of Mr Pickens?

In the belief, that Mr Slade is a man of religious principles—desirous of nothing but the truth, on all subjects to which he may apply his very handsome intellectual powers—that he is making rapid progress in attaining it on the much disputed subject of abolition—and that he will not be offended and contemptuously reject the well meant effort of one, who wishes to see him

and all others, as useful as they can be, to their country and the world—a venture to suggest for his consideration, a few points connected with abolition, which may not heretofore have been presented so directly as we shall endeavor to do.

1. In the annals of slavery, is there any authentic record of its having been terminated by gradual emancipation, where even ONE HALF of the laboring class of the community were slaves? We believe, none can be found. Pennsylvania does not furnish one. She never had 5000 slaves, nor more than one to every forty whites. Neither does Massachusetts—for she had a proportion not greater than Pennsylvania;—and to her honor be it said, her abolition of slavery was immediate. She ingrafted on her constitution a truth, with which slavery was found to be inconsistent. Rather than give up the truth, she gave up slavery.

Mr Slade will find, on turning his attention to this part of the subject, that in all the states which have adopted the plan of gradual emancipation, (not even excepting New Jersey, where the number of slaves in proportion to the free was the greatest,) slave labor has been insignificant in importance, when compared with their free labor. Thus it was, that the small addition to the existing amount of free labor, made by the emancipation of the slaves, was almost, without being perceived, absorbed by the mass of free labor already in being.

Suppose, that in Kentucky, 5000 slaves—her annual increase—are emancipated each year: what would become of them? They have nothing, with which to purchase land, or in any way, to set up for themselves; and slaveholders will not employ such, to labor with their slaves. Thus it is, they are made outcasts and wanderers—and that very character held up by our opponents, as an objection to immediate emancipation.

2. Mr Slade would have "the right to hold men as goods and chattels, subject to sale and transfer, at the will of the master, to cease, and to be discontinued instantly and forever." At the same time, "he would not, at once, entirely emancipate him (the slave) from the control of his master." Now if Mr Slade had long been a witness of the process by which slavery is kept up on a large scale, he would testify to the truth of this position, that it cannot exist unless there is virtually, absolute power. Take from the master the power to whip up to the point of acquiescence in every thing that is required of the slave; the power to "sell and transfer" at will—and men cannot be retained in bondage.

If the master is to enjoy the labor from the circumstance of his having the control of the slave continued to him, without paying for it what is just and equal, it is but the mere repletion of injustice, which will have but little tendency to make the slave a better man, or to inspire him with respect and friendship for his master.

Why continue any of the "control" of a slave-master where every instance of its exercise is a transgression of inalienable rights? Will Mr S. look for a moment at this idea:—a slave intended to be free is yet subject to the "control" of a master—of a slave-master,—he disobeys,—what must be the resort on the part of the master? Not a dismissal of him from his service—a cessation of wages—a turning away from a comfortable situation—not a withdrawing of the stimulus of reward for his services. No; it must be the coercion of fear and bodily suffering. And those the master must push to the full extent of overcoming the contumacy of the slave. This, and nothing else, is precisely what constitutes slavery in its present aggravated form; and this is one reason why we know that all plans of gradualism will ever be found not even ennobling to the disease.

Mr S. has not, probably, given much of his attention to the operation of gradualism, under the form of "apprenticeship" in the British West Indies. Here the laws give the "control" which Mr S. considers desirable. The cruelties of this form of oppression, put to shame those that were perpetrated under the abrogated form of slavery. And just for this reason—that formerly the authority of the master was undisputed,—now, it is disputed. He must have his labor performed, and he finds himself shorn of some of his former power, (exercised as absolute only when this made it necessary) for compelling his performance. When there is a disputed authority, there will always be, as there always has been, jealousy, suspicion, and fierceness on the part of him who attempts to maintain it,—and on the part of him who is subjected to it, hatred and a thirst for revenge. Would Mr S. be willing to give "control" over any human being, except their own children, to the "Vigilance Committees" of the south—who trample openly on all rights, intruding their hands in the blood of the innocent that they may maintain their control over their fellow men?

We have already far exceeded our limits in these remarks. We feel how unclad and skeleton-like they must appear, and would be glad to give them more color; but we cannot. We trust, however, should Mr Slade see them, they will suggest to his well-read mind some new departments of this great subject on which it may profitably bestow its labors.

NEW YORK MARKET, March 5.

Flour.—Since our last there has been an advance of 12 1-2 cents in the prices of Western, owing to the comparative small stock of this description. We do not hear of any change worthy of notice in Southern. Sales of Richmond city mills are making at \$7.62 to \$7.75 principally for city use; Howard-street and Georgetown at \$7.50 to \$7.62. Rye flour continues to sell at \$5.50. We believe there is nothing doing in Indian meal.

Grain.—There is no northern or western wheat in market. We have received several additions to our previous stock of foreign wheat; and the quantity now in market is full 45,000 bushels. No sides have been made as the mills generally are closed with ice. Sales of Jersey rye have been made at \$1.03, an improvement of 3 cents. Oats have declined fully 3 cents and are dull sale. There have been large arrivals of Southern corn, say 30,000 bushels, and prices have declined 5 to 6 cents per bushel.

An Irish doctor advertises in a Dublin paper, that the deaf may hear of him at his house, in Liffy street, and his blind patients see him from 10 till 3.

Nothing important from Florida.